THE

"HINDU MESSAGE"

A Weekly Review of Indian and World-Problems from the Hindu Standpoint.

Editors: K. Sundararama Aiyar M.A., & T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A.

VOL. 1.] THURSDAY MARCH 7, 1918. [No. 20.

The **Hindu Message** stands for

(1) The Maintenance of British supremacy with self-government for India,

(2) Co-operation with the different communities of India without prejudice to Hindu Dharma,

(3) Education of the Hindus as an integral part of the Indian Nation,

(4) Advancement of Material prosperity on a spiritual basis and

(5) Dissemination of pure Hindu Culture.

Annual Subscription Rs. 6 only.

For *bona fide* students Rs. 3 only.

Single copy As. 2 only.

All business communications and remittances to be addressed to the Manager and all literary contributions and books for Review to be addressed to the Editor, THE HINDU MESSAGE, ***Srirangam.***

A Vision Of India.

THE GANGA—VI.

By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L.

Bhagiratha who in that lineage great
Was born a holy sovereign felt the woe
That had his proud ancestors laid so low.
His penance pure did ope the golden gate
Of Vishnu's love. And from their hapless fate
To save the Sagaras God bade Thee flow
To earth and quench the sin that yet did glow
In ashes where did end their kingly state.
But Thy imperial prowess who could bear
As Thou leapt from the opening sapphire skies
With power unwitnessed after or before?
He prayed God Shiva in His matted hair
To check thy downward force from paradise
And bid thee flow upon earth's waiting floor.

The Hindu Message

THURSDAY EVENING 7, MAR. 1918.

The Indian Executive Councillor.

There has been some discussion in the Indian Press of our Presidency regarding the question of the distinctive function of the Indian member of the Executive Council. In referring to this question here, we wish to avail ourselves of the experience gained so far. We have had four Indian Councillors in our own Presidency since the reforms introduced by Lord Morley came into force nine years ago. We believe that all have justified public expectations, even though they may have, in a few matters, taken views somewhat different from the opinions held by the modern and educated section of the public. Holding this opinion of those who have hitherto held this high office, we have not much difficulty in expressing our opinion regarding what the enlightened public should expect from those who hold it now or in the future.

In the *first* place, we are of opinion that it is not right to expect that he should be constantly in opposition,—dissenting from his European Colleagues and inditing minutes of dissent. We are of opinion that his usefulness and wisdom depend upon his being able, by suggesting acceptable compromises, to make the Government point of view approach, in as large a measure as may be found possible, to the view which he regards as Indian and also as *truly* conducive to the public welfare. While, ordinarily, he should *interpret* to Government what he regards as the *prevailing* Indian view, we think he must not fail to present what, according to his own judgment and conscience, he considers right and desirable even if it goes against that view, quite as much as he should present the same when it goes counter to the view taken by his European Colleagues. To hold that one who has risen to so eminent a position should, like a weather-cock, follow the varying phases or unthinking impulses of public opinion is as absurd as to expect that he should slavishly say ditto to the opinions formed by the European Executive Councillors.

In the *second* place, we cannot agree to the view that he must *always* support the view taken by the majority of the elected members of the Legislative Council. We rather agree with Lord Morley's opinion that Indian Executive Councillors must be "men of large minds with the interests of their province at heart, men of wide views who would sympathise with the good of India as a whole." This view is not inconsistent with occasionally differing from the opinion expressed by the majority of the elected members. For, as the present elected members are only elected by a secondary or tertiary body of electors, their opinions need not *necessarily* be understood as alone calculated to promote "the interests of the province or the good of India, as a whole." The Indian member of the Executive Council is not a *delegate* of the elected members of the Legislative Council. Even if they were chosen by them, as they are not, we do not see why they should consider themselves *merely* their mouthpieces or delegates, and

why they should not form their own opinion, at times, of what is conducive to their true interests and welfare. This view of their position and duties can stand, even if the elected non-official members of the Legislative Council were elected by the *primary* electors themselves, and when these primary electors form those sections of the people of the land who have the largest stake in it and, therefore, in its wise and beneficent administration.

In the third place, we are of opinion that the Indian Executive Councillor should, *as matters are at present*, be content to do as much good as possible to their country and countrymen *silently and secretly and* by compromises with his European Colleagues rather than be anxious to multiply or proclaim his differences with them. Especially at a time when great changes are impending in the existing system of government and when that system is becoming more and more liable to popular odium, disapproval, or attack, we do not think it is becoming in the Indian Member of the Executive Council to do anything which will make it more unpopular than it is by doing anything which will even smack remotely of what is known as playing to the gallery. This will only make the situation of Government more embarrassing than it already is, and certainly no one with any sense of delicacy, honour, or discriminative wisdom can be expected to enter the Government with the express purpose, in this time of transition, of only discrediting or exposing it.

Judging by the principles above laid down, we think that there is yet no reason why the public should be dissatisfied with the Hon. Mr. Rajagopalachariar's tenure of office as Executive Councillor. We have already explained, in regard to the recent discussion in the Legislative Council on District Boards' Powers, that the position he took was neither hostile to the popular interest nor in reality unfavourable to the position taken up by the elected members of that Council. Moreover, that position was quite consistent with the late Mr. Gokhale's three requirements of (1) more government on the spot in the districts, (2) a larger share of it to educated men who deserve confidence, and (3) more provision for local grievances being ventilated and settled within the District itself.

We think it also premature to form an opinion now regarding the Hon'ble Mr. Rajagopalachariar's tenure of office. Only one-fifth of the period for which he is appointed has expired. We shall do well to wait long enough to be able to judge of him by his deeds and in the light of the principles we have enunciated above in regard to the position he occupies as the Indian Member of the Executive Council.

Students and Political Meetings.

We purpose to consider carefully and dispassionately this important question in the light thrown on it by the recent discussion in the Legislative Council. In our view, two important points have to be borne in mind in all discussions regarding students' privileges and obligations. *First*, times have changed, and students to-day ought not to be subjected to a hot-house system of college training, but allowed to know something of the world of men and affairs around them —that world where they will soon

themselves have to play their several parts in the great game of life. *Secondly*, they must also subject themselves to the rules of college discipline and learn the duty of obedience and the habit of reverence by practical conformity to the precepts of their teachers and all healthy requirements of college control and college life.

As regards the *first* point, we may at once state that we cannot agree with the Director of Public Instruction that it is enough if students study politics in books and newspapers and discuss political topics and views in debating societies. We do not see why the Hon'ble Mr. Stone views with horror the prospect of students "hearing political speeches." His reason is that "the personal influence of a speaker did much to influence the opinions of students." What is the harm? In the College, also, the "personal influence" of the teacher ought equally to "influence their opinions" if the teacher is really worth his salt. We think that, whether at College or outside, our young men should come under all healthy personal influences and forces available in the land. But the question has also to be considered whether the students are to have perfect freedom to attend any and every political meeting so-called, and to get into contact with all sorts of men, desirable and undesirable, or whether any restriction is needed and, if so, in whom the discretion is to be vested.

We think most people of the right sort will agree that some restrictions are needed, and that the duty of exercising a wide discretion must be assigned to some responsible authority. The Hon'ble Mr. Siva Rao said of our undergraduates that "they were quite able to take care of themselves." Not all of them, certainly. Many have been known to drift for want of guidance, and some get into bad hands. If Mr. Siva Rao denies this, we can only say that he knows precious little of some of our South Indian students. The Hon'ble Mr. V. K. Ramanujachariar said that "it is desirable that they should be brought under the influence of great patriotic orators." We certainly agree. But are the students to be left to decide for themselves who are such and who are not! Several undergraduates are only boys of fifteen or sixteen, and the responsibility of advising them properly should be vested in a proper person. Mr. V. K. Ramanujachariar said:—"In my opinion, persons responsible for the control of students are parents." But are all parents in this country educated men possessing a full sense of responsibility and capable of exercising it properly? Certainly not,—for we know there are many who are imperfectly acquainted with affairs of any kind and are unfit by education or character to exercise any influence or control on anybody in any matter. Is anything to be done at all for such or not? Are they to be allowed to drift hither and thither without any guidance or counsel? We believe that, in order to meet such cases at least, the discretion is rightly invested by Government in the heads of colleges. Of course, only a general rule or order can be framed by Government to this effect, and it is not right for Government to say, that their order is only applicable to boys who have no parents capable of guiding them aright. For, if the Principal is to be allowed to judge of the competence of parents in this matter, this will lead to much heart-burning and complaint, and

numerous appeals will be sent to the Director of Public Instruction or even the Government itself against the Principal's orders.

Objections are made to the vesting of such discretion in the heads of colleges. *First*, the Hon'ble Mr. Narasimha Iyer says that "Government still maintained the policy of the original G. O." What is it? At least as now modified, that policy is surely based on the idea that a distinction must be made between desirable and undesirable political speakers, and that the students must be properly guided. To this view and position, at least, there can and ought to be no objection. But the Hon'ble Mr. Siva Rao says:—"The Government expect them (the heads of colleges) to loyally carry out the intentions of the Government." But the Hon'ble Mr. V. K. Ramanujachariar pointed out that Principals have not failed to use their own discretion, and Government do not propose to interfere with the exercise of such discretion. Mr. Ramanujachariar, however, finds another fault in the system:—"This differential treatment (of students in different places owing to the varying discretion of Principals) leads to local irritation." In our view, such occasions will be rare, very rare. For, Principals generally try to accommodate themselves to the wishes of students. This is usually the case even with the Principals of Government Colleges, and almost invariably with all others. The Principals of Government Colleges are as fully entitled to our confidence and respect as others. Do they not usually help our students in various ways in the after-lives of our students quite as much as they do while they study at College? It is a great mistake to suppose that Principals and Professors of Colleges are less attentive to the advancement of the progress and welfare of students than their parents or our public men. We think that the objection cannot be sustained In this connection, the Hon'ble Mr. Narasimha Iyer said that "two days stay with Gokhale or Malaviya would do more good to students than two years' attendance at College." In the *first* place, no head of a College is likely to interdict students from hearing the speeches of such great men, or even of smaller public men so long as they are not known to be objectionable on special grounds. In the *second* place, have there not been—and are there not to-day—great educators, Indian and European? Has the world lost its capacity to produce great educators,—men quite as great as the great public men of the past and present? Why indulge in so unsuitable a comparison? A cause which requires to be supported by a superfluous and exaggerated sentimentation like what underlies this strange and silly statement is, in our view, avowedly weak, if not also self-condemned. If there are great men like Gokhale and Malaviya in public life, there are also great men like Bose and Gopala Rao among the Principals and Professors who have shed a lustre on the profession of education.

Mr. Siva Rao's objection is that "The Government expect them (the heads of Colleges) to loyally carry out the intentions of Government" The Principals are not all of them officers of Government. In fact, there are only 3 or 4 of such among the heads of Colleges. The Principals are also, most of them men of strong individuality. Some, moreover, have as strong sympathies for the national

cause as the Hon'ble gentlemen who represent it in the Legislative Council. Moreover, we have before us the unquestionable fact, already referred to, that different Principals take different courses in regard to students' desire to hear or meet the same popular leader, and this shows that there are neither uniform instructions from Government, nor any uniform principles of dealing, on the part of heads of colleges, with the relations subsisting, or that ought to subsist, between popular orators and leaders.

With regard to the *second* point which we mentioned at starting,—the question of discipline at College,—we quite agree with the Hon'ble Mr. Narasimha Iyer when he says that Government should not attempt "to wean people (i.e., students) away from patriotic movements," and that they should "remove the impression" now existing that they are engaged in such an attempt. The Government have already taken certain steps in this direction. They have already released the interned Home Rule trio, and now they have entrusted to heads of colleges the discretion to regulate the conduct of students in regard to their attendance at political meetings and speeches. We think that heads of colleges should alone have this discretion. Otherwise, the discipline in colleges would vanish, and some fine youths at least would be spoiled while yet in tender years and irretrievably too. The Hon'ble Mr. Siva Rao says that the "old rules" would be "found quite adequate to meet the evil of a revolutionary agitation." The conditions to-day in Indian politics are greatly changed from what they were ten years back. As a matter of fact, several imperfectly educated men are seen on occasions moving about, and several students come into contact with them. There is, therefore, some need for a change in the educational rules dealing with the conduct of students in regard to politics and political leaders or meetings. We think also that the most desirable change is that heads of Colleges alone should have the discretion to regulate the students' behaviour in their relations to political life and political leaders.

Notes and Comments.

Mr. C. V. Vasudeva Aiyar, contradicts the statement made in the New India (of the 9th February) by its Kumbakonam correspondent that the renowned Pandit Mahamahopadhyaya Ramasubba Sastri approved of sea voyage if it is undertaken for public and philanthropic purposes. Mr. Vasudeva Aiyar's letter is published in this issue. The letter from the well-known scholar denies what has been attributed to have been said by him. Will the Correspondent have the fairness, now at least in as much as the learned scholar's views are before him, to come forward boldly to apologise to Mr. Sastriar for giving publicity to what he heard others say without knowing Mr. Sastriar's views himself at first hand?

* * *

We know well that a statement, however unfounded when once put into circulation, goes its round for ever and ever, even long, long years after it has been contradicted. We shall presently give an example,—a very notorious one. In modern India, especially, men have learnt from the West the fine art of being in a hurry about everything. The calmness and imperturbability on which our ancestors set the highest value in life has departed for ever. Men not only rush in hot haste by railway from the North of India to the South and from the South to North several times in the course of a few months with little or no work to do which cannot be transacted by telegraph, but also rush to hasty conclusions

of all sorts and do not care to make themselves acquainted with facts as they truly are. Of India's many losses by its contact with the West, the loss of this strength of serenity is, in our view, the greatest and most deplorable. In great matters and in small, this Western tendency to rush and push hither and thither in unthinking haste has seized hold of us. It is, therefore, no wonder that people also make unfounded statements in their anxiety to give a momentary impulse to a cause they may have at heart. The Veda says, "Truth alone triumphs". But the Kali age we live in is the age of sensualism, strife, lying, and sophistry. Men care only for glory and power and wealth. The great sage whom his contemporaries honoured with the title of "कवितार्किककेसरी" "the lion of poets and logicians" Sri Venkatanatha—commonly known as Vedantadesika and one of the very greatest of India's great teachers, has said of the men of his time what is still more true of men to-day,—

न धर्ममनुवर्तन्ते न कामान्नापुनर्भवम् ।
अर्थमेकमुपाश्रित्य दुःखमेवोपभुञ्जते ॥

"Men neither follow Dharma, nor (pure) love, nor liberation from re-birth. They attach themselves to Artha (worldly prosperity) as their sole aim and suffer only misery (thereby)."

*
* *

Last week we exposed the unfounded nature of the statement regarding Satyakama Jabala,—that he was not by birth a Brahmin. We showed from the incidents of the story as given in the Chandogya-Upanishad that he was of Brahmin birth. We now deal with another like statement which is often quoted as proving that the Indian distinction of Varna or Caste is later than the Rig-Veda. The context refers to the story of Kavasha-Ailusha, in the Aitareya-Brahma (II. 3, 19 in Martin Haug's Edition,—or Chap. VIII, Khanda, 1). The statement that Kavasha was a Sudra and was admitted into the class of Rishis as the seer of certain Suktas in the Rig-Veda, was set a-going so long ago as the 14th September 1881 before the International Congress of Orientalists in Berlin, and it still does yeoman service to those who want to destroy or discredit Hindu Society. Even the Maharaja of Kasimbazaar who says, "I personally believe in caste", quoted it in his speech at the recent meeting of the Hindu Sabha at Allahabad. The terms of the Berlin statement are as follow:—"Kavasha Ailusha who was a Sudra and son of a low woman was greatly respected for his literary attainments and admitted into the class of Rishis. Perhaps the most remarkable feature of his life is that he, Sudra as he was, distinguished himself as the Rishi of some of the hymns of the Rig-Veda". In the *first* place, the Rig-Veda does not state that he was a Sudra. So, the Rig-Veda cannot be the source from which the Berlin Orientalist derived his information. The only other source is the passage contained in the Aitareya-Brahmana above referred to in the extract quoted from the proceedings of the Berlin Congress. If we refer to this passage we find Kavasha Ailusha is spoken of as follows:—"दास्याः पुत्रः कितवोऽब्राह्मणः" The expression used is, "दास्याः पुत्रः *not* दासीपुत्रः". This shows clearly that Kavasha Ailusha was not a Sudra, as he would have been if the latter expression had been used. Hence Sayana rightly says:—"दास्याः पुत्र इत्युक्तिरधिक्षेपार्था" "The statement that he was the son of a slave is meant as a term of reproach and censure". Sayana also says:—"कितवो द्यूतकारस्तस्मादब्राह्मणोऽयम्" which means,—"Gambler, and therefore not a Brahmana, this person". As Kavasha Ailusha was expelled as unfit to take his seat among a body of Rishis assembled for performing a Somayaga, (sacrifice of the Soma plant) on the allegation that he was a gambler—an allegation later on ignored or withdrawn when he was discovered to be a Rishi of a hymn (of the Rig-Veda)—we see that the expression "Not-a-Brahmana" means only that, though a Brahmana, he was a degraded person and so could not sit as a *Dikshita* among a body of Dikshitas. That Rishis were Brahmins is also clear from the fact (stated in this Vedic text) that, when they first expelled him, they contemptuously called him *A-brahmana* (not-a-Brahmana)

for being a gambler. Sayana's Bhashya sets the story in the text in its proper light, and entirely overthrows the impossible construction put upon the passage by the Berlin Orientalist. The refutation of it we have now given may have been given before, and will doubtless be repeated again and again, but we feel quite certain that the original misrepresentation will continue to flourish. For, there are men about now—and there will be in the future—who are interested in quoting it again and thereby enabling it to set out on a further career of adventure.

* * *

The truth is that the Indian sacred books can only be interpreted correctly by those who, by daily contact with Hindu life and observance or by getting into close and sympathetic communion with those authorities, have learned and comprehended fully their aims and points of view. It is especially necessary to be a *Sishya* (or disciple) under a Guru in order to gain the insight into their true spirit and import. Many are unwilling to undertake the trouble and loss of apparent dignity which Hindu discipleship almost always involves in more or less degree. Most modern Indians, also, are busy men and so are prepared to take on trust any and every statement, especially when a person holding a high office or having a name and fame of some kind—and a foreigner, too, of some note—lends them the weight of his authority and support. But such people are usually very unreliable guides, for they know not what they are talking about. Hence many are misled and fall into the abyss. We have already given several illustrations of this kind in our journal, and hope, as we proceed, to prick many more bubbles and expose several dangerous pitfalls into which men have fallen under blind guidance. The task may be none pleasant, but has to be done in the interest of truth.

THE HINDU MESSAGE will be posted regularly every week to any address in India, Burma and Ceylon on payment of Rs. 6 only per annum; For all foreign countries within the Postal Union it will be despatched on payment of 10s. 6d. per annum. All subscriptions are payable in advance and should be remitted to the Manager, "*The Hindu Message*", Srirangam.

Olla Podrida.

This year's cattle show at Ongole shows the dangers and follies that lurk under the forms of the modern self-advertising civilisations. Those that carry off the prizes at these shows are not the ryots but professional rearers of cattle who rear for prizes and not from any higher motives. This is the first element of rottenness in these shows—Well have these been termed *shows* !!! The next and worse element is that cattle-breeders from Dutch East Indies and other distant places carry off such show cattle. We have always felt that this has been the only result of the so-called industrial exhibitions. Foreign exploiters got in them an opportunity to study Indian tastes and dump cheap goods on Indian markets to satisfy such tastes and thus kill the few poor straggling industries we have.

* * *

The evil is not so much in the exhibitions but in the exhibitors and their compatriots. We have no real love of country or love of enterprise or love of science. Hence our men will buy anything from anywhere, sell anything anywhere, and strut about like jackdaws in peacock feathers. So long as the true spirit of *swadesi* is not in us, so long as we do not develop abstract and applied sciences, and so long as we do not start industrial enterprises, exhibitions and shows are only additional instruments of national suicide. If we progress in those directions, then they are additional instruments of national uplift and progress. But these branches of work are humble and silent. Our educated men of to-day do not care for humble and silent work. They want high-sounding though empty titles whether these are conferred by the Government or by the modern god-let of the daily press and seats in mad parliaments and what not.

* * *

One other point about the cattle show. Mr. C. V. Krishna Row pointed out in his welcome address that the bulk of the cows taken from Ongole are sold to butchers when dry and that the calves themselves mostly die of starvation. Shame on you, modern India, that hast lost thy hold on

the spiritual aspect of things which was thy true crown of glory in the past and that hast not common sense and worldly wisdom enough to know how to shut and open the doors wisely and well!

* * *

The new fad of national education seems likely to become an all-devouring ogre. We have all read of what became of the inaugurator of a new life in *Frankenstein.* The protagonists of the new movement ask the trustees of temples to hand over temple monies to the society for the promotion of national education. It is a well-known fact that modern charity has turned away from temples to a large extent. Are old endowments also to be exploited? As a matter of fact the temples have a great duty to perform in the direction of educating the archakas, maintaining the purity and power of Sanskrit and Vernacular religious learning, sending out preachers, etc. in addition to preserving by repairing if not by rebuilding the temples and keeping up the traditional systems of worship. It is a well-known fact that even the temples with immense revenues are unable to do anything worth mentioning in these directions. Then again there is the duty of each big temple having all the other temples in a given area affiliated to it and of preserving them. How many small temples have gone to ruin before our eyes though we pretend to be religious. Sanctimonious hypocrites that we are! Each ruined temple bears witness in the august tribunal of God against us. Now there comes the new faddist to bring into existence new forms of depletion of temple revenues, as if the present day managers, trustees, and archakas were not enough by themselves.

* * *

What new methods the new faddist invents for the cause of national education! Undials, handfuls of rice, self-denial bands, badges of self-sacrifice, collections of jewels, fancy bazaars, lotteries, lucky dips, Wedderburn annas, Gokhale pies, national education week poems reproduced in facsimile, orders of appointment of chancellors and pro-chancellors and vice-chancellors and registrars and examiners and professors and lecturers and tutors in facsimile, national university extension lectures, and so on and so on. Go on, make yourselves happy and let the hunt for money and jewels and what not go on! We have no quarrel with the spirit but with the men, the means, the methods, and the ideals.

* * *

The most exasperating feature about the matter is that there are important measures of educational work to be taken up and realised as soon as possible for the sake of the future of our beloved children and the welfare of our beloved motherland. Are we to spoil these chances because some of our modern educated men are dazzled by glittering ideals whose very distance lends enchantment to the view?

* * *

We certainly wish the collections to be made for our educational uplift. But they cannot and should not be handed over to those that run the present show until more details are stated as to men, means, methods, and ideals and until the details are such as to satisfy us. Is not this the proper method? It seems to us that it is so.

SCRUTATOR.

Presidential Address at the 4th All-India Hindu Conference

[BY H. H. THE JAGADGURU SHRI SANKARACHARYA OF KARVIR PEETH]

(Published, and circulated to us, by authority—Ed.)

SWAMIES, MAHARAJA SAHEB, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

It is indeed a very great privilege to me to be present here in your midst to-day and make the opening speech at this FOURTH ALL-INDIA CONFERENCE. When I received the invitation from one of the great leaders of our country, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and from the Secretaries of the Reception Committee, to preside over the Conference, I thought that I had a very fine opportunity to give expression to my feelings of joy at seeing the most progressive work done by the All-India Hindu Conference, which though quite young, is full of promise from our nationalistic standpoint. This Conference is certainly far-reaching in effect. It

can explain clearly the constitution of the Hindu Society, it can expound the principles underlying our social traditions and more important than all, it can suggest the standards for adjusting and adopting the several social needs under the modern changed conditions for the guidance of those who profess Hinduism. No true scholar of our Sacred Sanskrit learning can ever fail to see that our ancestors led most enlightened and most progressive lives and their civilization, if civilization indicates a high standard of intellectual and moral advancement, in whatsoever branches it may be, was next to none. I am also of a sincere belief that if India should once again achieve that ancient glory which characterised her centuries back and which has struck admiration into the minds of the most fastidious critics of the civilized world, then our standard of social, religious and political life in India should be one having its backbone on our ancient Hindu ideals and being elastic enough as to comprise within itself all possible scopes for our onward march among the great nations of the world. To-day all of us have met here, I believe, to give expression to those grand ancient ideals of our forefathers and suggest how with those ideals we should work out the constructive policy of establishing unity among the several Hindus. The place chosen for such a sacred Conference is most unique from the standpoint of the Hindu spiritual sentiment. Prayag is the centre of confluence of the rivers that we consider most sacred and this confluence is significant in so far that we see sacredness arising from the unity of holy waters, just as we expect a sacredness of purpose in the unity of all Hindus even from the modern standpoint. Such Conferences as we are now engaged in will, I hope, explain away all social differences and cement us all to oneness of thought, word and deed. The several activities in the country, all aiming at reforms of all sorts, their respective influence on the minds of the millions that inhabit India and the several social binding forces that are forging the scattered races and creeds into one solid nationality are a striking proof that the time is come for our evolution. We should be up and doing. It is now or never. Just as the dawn-time awakens people from their dead slumbers, so the present time awakens us from our torpor. If instead, we feel lulled into sleep after waking at the dawn-time we have to reap the fruits of our idleness and be sitting moping and moaning for all time. Even those who consider themselves quite snug and warm in their corners should get up and work for the common cause. We should lose no opportunity of marching onward if we should be allowed to remain a progressive and individual nation. It is certainly sad to look at our degraded condition and it is only natural that we should shirk off our lethargy and gird up our loins to win our goal. In ancient India each man tried his best to serve the common purpose before he even thought of his own needs, and consequently degradation was a word unknown to our ancients. We should also justify our position now-a-days on that great principle of selflessness and should unanimously work for the regeneration of our motherland. Whatever was a binding force in ancient India has now become a curse, a bane, and an eye-sore in modern India. Whatever conduced to the well-being of our ancestors is now treated with contempt and ridicule, whatever were emphasised by our ancient Rishis and Acharyas are now taken for antiquated curiosities and is it a wonder that we should be in a fallen state when we are not true to ourselves, to our own nation and to our fathers? Dharma it was which worked wonders in days of yore and it is the absence of Dharma now-a-days that should count for our downfall. The Varnashrama Dharma of ancient India was a beautiful organising principle of Hindu society. How smoothly did it work till very recently and what great blessings did it confer in ancient days upon India. In these days we see chaos and confusion everywhere. The Brahmins have lost their real character, the Kshatriyas have forgotton their responsiblities, the Vaishyas have occupied a totally insignificant position and then what to speak of Shudras and others. There is a mad race for money and empty honours and everyone bloats or blinks as he realises his goal or fails to reach it. Brahmins in ancient days were selfless workers, honorary professors, free legal advisers and in a word the backbone of the administration. Is it strange that they should be worshipped like gods? Now we see the Brahmins, the descendants of the same selfless workers, most selfish and crafty people, onesided and bigoted, competing in the markets with cobblers and men

of every possible profession only for the sake of lucre, still expecting to be honoured as their ancestors. Nothing can be more anamolous than this. There are Kshatriyas in the country but what are they? Do we see even the slightest semblance of the ancient glory of their forefathers? All greatness that characterised those ancient men, the warrior class seems to have faded away. Is it not time yet that India should show her true warrior blood in these Kshatriyas. There are certainly hopeful signs that all is not lost in this quarter. Many, many are they from India who went to the battlefield with true Kshatriya spirit, and I hope that in the near future the Kshatriya race will blossom forth in hundreds and thousands. The Vaishyas accumulated wealth in former times to serve their king and country and led most progressive and peaceful pursuits. Whom can we call the merchant class in modern India? What to speak of other classes? In a word we can say that the ancient system has been so much disturbed that it is not possible to restore it to the old ways and methods. Nor is it practicable that in this century in India we can achieve much by closely confining ourselves to that system. But one thing we should all bear in mind. Whatever the creed or caste that a man belongs to in India, whatever profession or occupation a man is engaged in, whatsoever tendencies he may have, it is our bounden duty to see that so far and so long that he works for the good of the country he deserves our best co-operation and our best regards. It is only when such a solid social principle is at the bottom of all our activities we can say that we are all working on a nationalistic principle, and it is only then, I believe, that our national aspirations will meet with success. Chaturvarnya, which was a unifying principle, now serves or is made to serve the seed of discord. The Brahmins who were revered and respected till now have become objects of ridicule and contempt. The Sadhus who were living examples of piety and godliness and the very incarnation of patriotism have now transformed themselves into begging mendicants. Their touch is profane and their look is impure and immorality is ever associated with them. If transition ever worked havoc into society at any time in India, it has done so now. Dharmagurus exercised beautiful powers in old days to save society from imminent ruin. The social equilibrium was maintained by Gurus on one side and the kings on the other side. The kings punished wrong-doers while the Gurus by their wholesome influences and good counsels not only prevented wrong-doing but also encouraged good actions. Thus the Gurus in ancient India became very powerful in society and in administration. They were given lands, Jahagirs, etc., for maintaining a large number of disciples always with them. It was their duty to guide them, to teach them sound principles of action, to ward them off from danger and to make them good and useful citizens of the land. Even kings could not disregard such Gurus. In the name of Dharma they exercised absolute powers and kept the country under peace and urged its progress. We of to-day do not know indeed what we have to do. Each one of us is trying to assert individual opinions, but in some cases it may do good, but in the chief purpose, the common cause, the good of the country it does great harm. What is wanted is guidance, a proper guidance on the lines of Dharma. Human nature being different, naturally individual opinions differ and with such differences how can a universal principle develop unless we are ready to sink our individual differences in the achievement of that mighty principle. Consider here for a moment the ancient Kulapatis. They gathered round them thousands of students, trained them all to act up to the needs of the time and clime, and with one voice each of them obeyed the Kulapati and from the Himalayas down to Cape Camorin the influence of these Kulapatis was immense. The stability, the progress and the establishment of good will between the rulers and the ruled were in their hands. Now-a-days, our position is ridiculous. We have forgotten our own responsibilities and expect the Government to look to our needs. Why should we do so? If every one of us in this sacred land of Bharata-Varsha were to realise his own responsibilities and requirements and act up to them, we need not approach Government at all for the fulfilment of our desires. The Government will rather come to us and look to what we want. The one saddest feature of modern India is that some people are not in the least willing to come out of their warm corners, some

others again do not care to see what their neighbours are doing, and again a self-less few are doing what best they can do irrespective of their personal interest. How can march and progress begin and continue under such disadvantages. If our aspirations should be attained each one must understand that he is an Indian and accordingly adjust himself to all the necessary needs of the day. Education is a mighty problem coming under that need It has been the most complex problem agitating the hearts of all the leaders in the land. The ancient system of education was good for those times and no one but a bigot can emphasise that, with that system alone we can achieve progress to-day in India. Equally wrong is he who champions the Western system and declares that if India is to be an entity at all she should foster under the most beautiful, most useful and most progressive Western system. How sad that there are hundreds of persons talking in one way or the other. In their blind attachment to one or the other, they do not see that a good deal of mischief is wrought and the younger generation, of an age when they cannot form any standard of judgment and cannot realise the importance of their future action, fall an easy prey and all round there is distress. I do not dwell at length here on the ancient methods of education because they cannot be practicable for our modern needs and purposes under the changed conditions. I shall touch on a few points of the present-day University system in India. This system has done certainly great good. It has thrown open the gates of the Western culture. The breadth of mind and the eagerness to partake in the civilized activities on the side of material advancement have been the direct result of the University education. Directly or indirectly the influences that are running the quarters of the globe are made to be felt in the hearts of Indians for their good whether they are willing or not. But equally heavy is the mischief played by this system. Our national genius and national temperament are killed out. We are made to ape forgetting our individuality and originality. All our sacred traditions are slowly leaving us away. By the time the University courses are over the so-called finished products of the Universty have learnt to despise their own traditions and pretend to successfully imitate the traditions of Westerners and the result is disastrous. When they come out of the University into the practical world, how many of them are successful in their aping. Many of them are moral bankrupts and some of them hopeless desperates with neither principle nor ambition and a few, a fortunate few, have been able by other circumstances to lead fair and honest lives. There is another side of this educational activity which is assuming tremendous proportions. Whether it is good or bad is not my purpose here to mention. Time the greatest judge alone can prove that. Strong, very strong individual convictions are formed in the hearts of the young men while within the University doors and all the old traditional relations are set at defiance by them. They do not attach any such sacred importance to their relation with their parents, Gurus, if there are any and even the Almighty Being. There is none who can guide them and each young inexperienced man thinks himself a nestor. They mister their fathers and mister God if they are convinced that there is one. It is this strong individual conviction that is the motive principle of the younger generation in all the present-day activities. Nobody can try to check it when it has developed so far and when it is almost ingrained in their constitutions. What is more, the whole world is marching towards democratic ideas and no Government, no system of repression can ever stop it. The attack makes the march swifter and more dangerous. Take one simple instance. The action of the Government of Madras in interning Mrs. Besant only aggravated the situation in the country and people flocked in thousands round her banner and even the greatest men began to fear what proportions the agitation would assume. Thank God, her liberty and the influence of His Excellency the Viceroy and that of His Majesty's Secretary of State have calmed the political atmosphere. What I insist here is that for good or bad the cards are let loose and the march has begun. There is no use forcing people to recede. As far as I think only two solutions suggest themselves to me out of the difficulty. The Government and the responsible officers forming the Government must take the public largely into their confidence and treat the public on equal lines.

The domocratic spirit that has so far advanced should not be a meaningless empty term but should work on most happy lines. In India, unlike other countries, the religious principle should underlie all such movements and then only we can rest assured that the movement will meet with success. That religious principle is Dharma which gave peace and progress to our ancestors, which established the social solidarity of the Hindus which was the foundation of their intellectual advancement and which alone made India the most ancient country of the world live even to-day with all her freshness. To achieve our ends, to realise our aspirations, to work out our ideals and to establish once again the ancient glory of our Mother India we should resort to Dharmic measures and infuse that Dharmic spirit into all our activities ever and anon. On that and that alone rests our hope of nation-building. On that lie the several binding principles of society bringing each man to love his neighbour as himself and through that alone the Mighty Lord will bless our enterprises.

Gentlemen, with this brief introduction I shall now treat the provisional list of subjects for consideration of this FOURTH ALL-INDIA HINDU CONFERENCE. This list gives the most beautiful points which touch generally and particularly almost all the phases of our Hindu life to-day and which require the many factors of Hindu social solidarity to be clearly brought forth for the understanding of every Hindu and the practical application of his every-day life. Those that are responsible for the preparation of the provisional list of subjects deserve to be congratulated for that all-embracing character of the list in the time-honoured organisation of our social life and I shall briefly touch on them as suits the time and the dignity of the place.

I.—Our first and foremost duty in having assembled here to deliberate the further actions of the Conference is to pray God to bless the Allied arms with glory and speedy victory. In mentioning about the War, it may not be out of place here to offer a word or two from the standpoint of the Hindu ideal and Hindu Dharma. The present ghastly war is the outcome of the horrid development of science put into wrong use. Our ancestors, with their genius and innate powers could have achieved even greater things in the material side of life. But they knew that, if material civilisation advanced abnormally the crisis would be inevitable and the whole world would meet with disaster. Many a passage can be seen to this effect from our sacred books. To them the peace and progress of the world was more important and they lived plain-living and high-thinking lives. The Western civilisation which, until recently, considered itself the highest civilisation the world ever saw and which had no satiation in material wants and material ambitions is a striking and living proof of what nations ought to suffer under such civilisations bereft of the principle of Dharma. The horrible taste of the Germans in this war and the still more horrible methods of their warfare are loathsome to everyone. The sense of justice and preservation of small independent kingdoms that characterised the Allies is certainly the noblest sentiment ever seen in the history of politics. Though I believe that the All-knowing and All-powerful God had his own motive in bringing about this great war, as men it is our bounden duty to pray to Him to bring this war to a glorious termination. Indians have done their best in contributing to the war with men and money and in never flinching in further help. They have done all that loyally, and I am sure that they will do their utmost in seeing that the Allied arms are ever resourceful to march on to a speedy victory. It is the every-day habit of a Hindu to pray God to bless the world with peace and happiness and now as so many of us have gathered together on this auspicious occasion, I believe that our joint prayers give greater strength to the purpose and God roused thereby will bless the cause of the Allies who have sacrificed so much for justice and humanity.

(To be continued.)

Tuberculosis.—I.

BY S. P. THIAGARAJAN.

[*No claim is set up, for this and following articles, of originality of any kind.*]

Great efforts are now being made to cope with one of the most fatal maladies to which the human race is subject. The British Congress on Tuberculosis, held in London in July, 1901, will long be memorable in the annals of public health. The fact that the

late King Emperor Edward VII evinced a great personal interest in the proceedings, and that eminent experts from all over the world assembled with a view of concentrating their united wisdom and research upon this supremely important subject—Professor Koch also being present—all combined to make this Conference distinguished above all others.

It was further memorable for the startling announcement by Professor Koch that, after a considerable investigation aided by experiments, he "felt justified in maintaining that human tuberculosis differs from bovine, and cannot be transmitted to cattle." He proceeded:—"It seems to me very desirable, however, that these experiments should be repeated elsewhere, in order that all doubt as to the correctness of my assertion may be removed". He stated that the German Government had appointed a commission to make further inquiries on the subject.

Dr. Koch next proceeded to discuss human susceptibility to bovine tuberculosis. He observed that "this question is far more important to us than that of the susceptibility of cattle to human tuberculosis, highly important as that is too." He went on to say, "It is impossible to give this question a direct answer, because, of course, the experimental investigation of it with human beings is out of the question." This is rather an amazing statement, coming from the inventor of *Tuberculosis*, with the aid of which innumerable experiments have been made, and are even now being continued, upon human beings with fearfully fatal results. Soon after this speech was delivered, *Tuberculosis* fell under a cloud, on account of its manifold failures. But it has since, like vaccine lymph, been improved and its use revived. Professor Koch also said, "If the bacilli of bovine tuberculosis were able to infect human beings, many cases of tuberculosis caused by the consumption of tubercle-bacilli could not but occur among the inhabitants of great cities, especially the children. And most medical men believe that this is actually the case". We need not discuss these questions here, as it has been established by the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis that bovine tuberculosis can be transmitted to man. It seems strange that Professor Koch, above all others, should ever doubt it.

It is a singular and sad commentary on human infatuation, as well as upon the supposed advancement of medical science, that we should continue to sow broadcast the seeds of consumption by inoculation, and then, after the crop has matured, to affect surprise and grief. Not long ago it would have been regarded as a cruel crime to suggest that consumptive patients should have out-door treatment. Now it is all the fashion, and is undoubtedly beneficial. If the Government had abolished vaccination, instead of offering to provide sanatoria for the treatment of consumption, they would have taken the first strong step towards ridding the human race of the devastating scourge of this malady.

The *Medical Times and Gazette* (1) stated that consumption "has widely spread since the introduction of vaccination, and within ten years (ending 1853), had slain its 68,204 victims in the Metropolis alone."

Dr. Bray, in a public speech at market Rasen, in 1876, stated:—"Facts have accumulated to show that since vaccination had become the law of the land, consumption, which before was comparatively unknown in this country, had, as it were, become an inheritance in certain families. The pure lymph, perhaps obtained from the greasy heels of a dismal old horse, was identical with the matter ejected from the lungs of a consumptive person—Vaccination was applied to the arm, but the poison diffused itself rapidly into the lungs, the blood, the stomach, and even the brain."

In the *British Medical Journal* (2), Dr. Simon says "that vaccine lymph may possibly contain the contagion in full vigour, even when the patient has not on his own person any outward activity, and that infection may follow both from tuberculosis and syphilis."

The *Medical Times and Gazette* (3) records that "M. Toussaint vaccinated a cow in an advanced stage of tuberculosis with lymph absolutely pure. The vesicles progressed normally, and with the lymph obtained from them he vaccinated different animals, all of whom subsequently became tuberculosis. The significance of these experiments can scarcely be over-rated."

Dr. Sir William J. Collins, M. D., writing from St, Bartholomew's Hospital, 10th September 1881, with reference to the communi-

(1) 1st January, 1854. (2) 13th December, 1875. (3) 3rd September, 1881.

cability of syphilis, erysipelas, pyaemia, and scrofula, says:—"That tubercle or scrofula can be engendered or intensified by vaccination is no new theory. Dr. Squirrel, an anti-vaccinator, suggested it seventy years ago, and now that a belief in the inoculability of Tubercle is gaining ground, it will probably not be long before this danger is considered as real as that of vaccino syphilis."

Recently numerous undeniable proofs have been adduced. In 1906, the *Petit Parisien* published an interview with Professor Vallee on the subject of Dr. Behring's bovo vaccine. The Professor said that he had at first believed in the efficacy of this remedy, but experiments had proved to him that it was no remedy at present for tuberculosis. Thus two calves which had been vaccinated and placed among tuberculosis cows contracted tuberculosis, whereas they ought to have remained healthy. Questioned as to whether bovo vaccine, a tuberculosis product, was really harmless, Professor Vallee replied that he tried it on guinea-pigs, which became tuberculosis, Professor Lignieres, of Buenos Ayres, obtained the same result. Professor Vallee said :—" If I had inoculated cows with it, not only should I not have vaccinated them, but I should certainly have given them tuberculosis."—(Reuter).

The *Keighley Herald* (4) contained a long article by "Retired Medico," entitled "Consumption's Cause". The writer expounds the view that the modern prevalence of consumption is an aftermath of arm-to-arm vaccination. He also comments on the similar risk attaching to vaccination with calf lymph, and concludes thus:—"This subject is a grave one for the people, for it entails the vital question of whether we are not doing our best still, through vaccination —I leave the question of the merits and demerits of vaccination to others—to propagate the growth of the greatest twentieth century scourge—consumption".

A paper on "The Great White Plague," read at the fifth annual meeting of the Connecticut Medical Union, in Waterbury, Conn., U.S.A., on 1st June, 1910, by Mr. L. W. Andersen, was printed in the *Sunday Herald*(5) and the writer expressed the belief "that tuberculosis will continue to exist and increase as long as the virus of animals, more or less impregnated with tuberculosis, is injected into the human blood".

Writing on the subject of vaccination and tuberculosis, Dr. Perron, Officier de la Legion d'Honneur, published an article of superlative importance in the *Gazette Heb do mad aire des Sciences Medicales*(6), from which the following excerpts are taken :—

"The possibility of conveying tuberculosis to man in the act of vaccination was long ago pointed out. Tuberculosis has, in fact, a special predilection for the bovine race which yields us our vaccine. There are few of these animals that escape its attacks; the calf, the heifer, sometimes bear traces of it but a few weeks after their birth."

"The cow as we have said, is the tuberculous animal *par excellence*."

"If, as announced by Professor Bouchard, the medium created by a vaccination can be destructive to one or several microbic species, we may add that by the law of reciprocity a medium of cultivation may at the same time be favourable to one or several microbes. That is exactly what happens with the cow, in respect of tuberculosis and vaccinia, diseases between which the soil of cultivation establishes, as we see, a striking connection."

"At the very time when we have created in the man the vaccinal soil, we run the risk of having, *ipso facto*, established that immoral state (*terrain immoral*) which is favourable to the tuberculosis genesis."

"If we now turn back and examine the events of the last century or so, we can show a constant increase of tuberculosis, a fact never hitherto satisfactorily explained. There was a time when this malady existed only as an exceptional thing; now, actually, in spite of the incessant progress in public and private hygiene, in spite of all the material improvements that have been made, it tends more and more to rise to the rank of a pestilence. It should be remarked that it strikes by preference at the young lives—that is, those who are, nevertheless, at the age when the physical resistance to mortific causes is the strongest. Now, a malady which originates in exhaustion, in vital poverty, should display its power in the inverse order, and should fall most heavily on the old."

"Side by side with this growing extension of tuberculosis, we see developing, *pari passu*,

(4) 8th July, 1910.

(5) 12th June, 1910.

(6) Translation published in the "Vaccination Inquirer," of December 1890, and January 1891.

and in the same period of time—that is to say, since the beginning of the century—the practice of vaccination. We may ask ourselves whether in this double simultaneous evolution there is not a hidden oneness. If tuberculosis, in spite of all sanitary precautions, has multiplied its attacks during the last hundred years, it is we submit, vaccination has come to create for it a propitious soil. That would explain not only its advancing growth in all civilised countries, but also its special influence over the young subjects, who are always more or less recently vaccinated, and consequently more receptive than the others in the presence of the bacillus."

"In all the European armies vaccination is the order of the day. On their arrival with their corps, the young soldiers are forthwith carefully revaccinated. Now, the military statistics of all countries show an enormous proportion of various forms of tuberculosis among soldiers, especially during the first and second year after their enlistment."

"Whence, then, come these attacks of tuberculosis, so sudden, so numerous, upon subjects that, but a few months before, the council of revision rightly declared to be fit for service? Tuberculosis of the lungs, of the organs, of the joints, of the bones, etc., all these fatal evils show themselves in the garrisons of all countries with a frequency before which one might well despair. We believe that we must simply seek the reason for these facts in the re-vaccination which awaits the recruits upon their arrival at their corps, and which transforms them forthwith into a medium which is receptive towards those germs of tubercle which swarm in centres of population. This revaccination immediately upon enlistment is all the more regrettable and inopportune since just at that moment the young man separated from his family, his country, his familiar conditions of life, undergoes, without any period of transition, total and radical changes in his manner of life, and thereby finds himself less well-equipped for resistance."

"We must recall the fact that tuberculosis is 'hatched' amongst bovines with very great facility......also to the progressive extension of tuberculosis since the end of the last century, and the concomitant extension of the vaccinal practice; and the inexplicable frequency of the malady amongst young or revaccinated subjects."

Here, then we have the *rationale* on the growth of consumption, communicated by an eminent pro-vaccinist, who is certainly not at all favourable to the antivaccinist view of the question. Dr. Perron writes with the idea of inculcating the exercise of more care in vaccinating, rather than—as one would have thought such risks ought to suggest to these experimenters with human bodies—to the entire abandonment of so dangerous and disease-distributing practice. The extraordinary growth of consumption in Japan, where, with increasing vaccination and re-vaccination, the death-rate from pulmonary tuberculosis has increased more than 50 per cent from 1886 to 1909; whilst on the other hand, with declining vaccination, the death-rate from the same cause has gone down in investigation both in England and Switzerland, is a striking confirmation of the argument of Dr. Perron.

Correspondence.

Sea-Voyage and Home Rule.

Sir,

It is but strange that the *New India's* own correspondent at Kumbakonam has written a correspondence under the above title to it which was published in its issue of the 9th February saying that Mahamahopadhyaya Ramasubba Sastrigal of Thiruvasalore being a noted scholar of great erudition in Sanskrit has approved of Sea-Voyage if it is meant for public and philanthropic purposes. I doubted the truth of the same and at once wrote to Mr. Sastriar himself asking him if it is a fact. His reply in Tamil, when translated, runs as follows.

Thiruvasalore,
13—2—1918.

Asirvatham. I have published a dissertation, wherein I have strongly asserted that Sea-Voyage is objectionable. Well, to speak of me as having *now* the contrary opinion that it is quite unobjectionable, is one of the greatest lies. I have not at all given publicity to such a view. The article is written without my knowledge. I repeat that *on any account* Sea-Voyage is out and out unallowable. Many are apt to say that I am of such and such an opinion with regard to matters that are objectionable and unpermissible "from a Shastraic standpoint". To attach weight to all such false representations is not wise. (Sd). RAMASUBBA SASTRY.

Now I leave the public to judge for themselves of the ways and means adopted by such people as, in the present case the "New India's" own correspondent at Kumbakonam, to make others believe what is entirely wrong and false. Is this the way these people are going to get Home Rule for India? Will that correspondent at Kumbakonam have the fairness, now having had an occasion to know Mr. Sastriar's view, to boldly come forward as a Gentleman and to apologise to Mr. Sastriar for having published what was perhaps only a hearsay, without trying to know Mr. Sastriar's views himself at first hand. C. V. VASUDEVA AIYER, *Tamil Pandit*.